

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 209. VOL. 18.]

LONDON, JANUARY, 1922.

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.]

WHY TAXES DO NOT CONCERN THE WORKERS.

One of the most effective election stunts with which capitalist agents have gulled the workers in recent years is, perhaps, Government extravagance. Not only against the Executive Government is the epithet "wasters" levelled, but against those in office on every district and urban council. County and borough council elections have, for years, been contested chiefly on this issue. Progressives and Labour candidates contended for reforms, more often than not proving that such reforms would benefit property owners, while the Moderates, or so-called Municipal Reformers, claimed that the ratepayers would be ruined or impoverished.

The anti-waste campaign being carried on to-day by a section of the Capitalist press is no different in essence from other campaigns directed against governments since the days of Pitt, or, to go far back into the past, the resistance of Roman and Grecian taxpayers to government extortion. Ancient and modern are alike, the protest of property owners against the payment of taxes levied on the property they own, for the purpose of making their ownership secure. Every property owner recognises the need for government, but general agreement between them ends there. Some argue that a government should confine its activities to the preservation of order within its territory and the prevention of aggression from abroad, thus keeping taxation at a minimum. Others believe that the government should not only do this, but should take cognisance of every social change, introduce reforms and legislation to meet the altered condi-

tions, and generally to supervise the whole field of industry in order to smooth over apparent crises and preserve the system against anarchy or revolution.

Between these two groups exist many shades of opinion; and sections of property owners are continually forming new parties around particular interests to obtain political control, in order to shift the burden of taxation from their own shoulders on to the shoulders of other property owners. The land owners, the kings of finance, the factory lords, the railway, mining and shipping magnates quarrel among themselves over the incidence of taxation, and the petty capitalists, led by "cheap money" cranks and others, quarrel with them all, though quite hopelessly. Their quarrel is hopeless because they are being slowly but surely squeezed out of industry by the big concerns. The financial monarchs control the Press and educate the voters to their point of view, the struggling petty capitalist whines about the bitter injustice, and tries to enlist the sympathy of the workers. But little capitalists are as much capitalists in essence as big ones. They are all property owners. All of them possess shares, big or small, in the land or other means of production, and if the workers side with the petty capitalists, placing in their hands the reins of power, the latter would merely use that power to improve their own position as far as possible, first by pushing taxation from their shoulders, secondly by endeavouring to hinder the growth of big businesses and combines, and thirdly by encouraging the smaller concerns.

It is easily seen from this that each section or party stands for its own interests; the thing that distinguishes them from each other is the nature or extent of their property. The fact that they own property, further, distinguishes them from the workers, who own none and, consequently, can have no interest in common with either section or party. Moreover, without workers to operate the machinery of production there could be no wealth for property owners to quarrel about, or from which taxes could be paid. The workers produce the wealth, the capitalists, big and little, own it between them, and with a portion of it maintain the necessary government forces to protect their ownership and enjoyment of the remainder.

In the days of Greece and Rome no one pretended that the slaves paid taxes, though they produced practically all the wealth of those societies. Why should the modern slave imagine that he does? Examine the worker's social status in the two epochs. The Roman slave was forced to work for the master who bought him, and in return was supplied with the necessities of life according to the standards of the time. The wage-slave is forced to work for the master who buys his labour-power at a price which seldom insures to him more than the bare necessities of life. The labour market is nearly always overstocked with the various forms of labour-power, with the result that competition for jobs is fierce and labour-power cheap. The tendency all the time is for wages to fall to the lowest level that will sustain life. The wealth produced by the Roman slave belonged to his master. The wealth produced by the wage-slave belongs to his masters. The Roman slave could not pay taxes because he had nothing to pay with. The wage-slave can only pay taxes if the amount of the tax is first added to his wages. In other words, if the necessities of life are taxed the same effect is produced as a rise in prices, and wages must be raised in order to preserve the standard of living. On the other hand, when prices fall for any reason whatsoever, wages are forced down by the masters. So much is the modern slaves' wages controlled by the rise and fall of prices that sliding scales have become general in many industries by which the workers' standard of living is evenly maintained by the adjustment of wages according to prices.

Thus in two widely separated epochs those

who produce the wealth of society possess all the characteristics of slavery in common. In each period they do not own property; are forced to work for a master and receive in return barely sufficient to enable them to live in accordance with prevailing standards and reproduce their kind. On the face of things it would seem preposterous to suggest that the workers in either period could be taxed. If anything was taken from the slave of antiquity he would deteriorate. If anything is taken from the modern worker his efficiency must suffer. The only way to make the worker a taxpayer is to give him more in wages than it costs him to live; but if this were done and the general height of wages raised for that purpose, it is quite obvious that the worker's position would not have been changed. In the same way, if the taxes imposed on the various articles consumed by the workers were taken off, prices and the cost of living would fall; the workers could live more cheaply and the price of their commodity, labour-power, would fall.

The fundamental difference between the workers of the two periods is that the chattel slave was himself a commodity to be bought and sold, while the wage-slave is assumed to be free, and the sole owner of his labour-power or energy. Given certain conditions such, for instance, as existed in the earliest days of capitalism, this difference would be of real benefit to the workers; but the development of capitalist industry makes it ever more difficult for the worker to sell his labour-power and, consequently, places him more completely at the mercy of the masters, both as regards his standard of living and his working conditions.

The modern worker is compelled to be more efficient and attentive to his work than the ancient. The conditions of the labour market make him more completely a slave, chain him more effectively to his task than any previous system of slavery has ever done. With all their physical aids to compulsion, the masters of Ancient Rome and Greece never had such slaves as the modern capitalist class have, yet the modern slave denies his slavery, because he is the sole owner of his energy. He forgets that he is compelled to sell it to some master, or masters, in order to live, and that when he does sell it he works at their bidding and for their profit while he remains in poverty.

Many well-meaning people complain bit-

terly of the injustice of taxing the necessities of life consumed by the workers. It is evident that they have not studied the situation, if our reasoning is correct. It is perfectly true that the workers are plundered, but not by taxation. It is true that the capitalist class, with all their agents and flunkies, live on the backs of the workers, but not by means of taxes extorted from them either directly or indirectly. The capitalists and their agents encourage the workers in the belief that they pay taxes for two reasons: to enlist their support in capitalist sectional and party squabbles and to hide from the workers the fact that they are enslaved and plundered in the workshops and factories.

There is one difference, however, between the ancient and modern slaves that, up till now, we have not taken into consideration. To-day the slave has a political status. He votes his masters, or their agents, into power. They in their turn are compelled to solicit his vote, to obtain his sanction to govern, because the workers are in a majority over the masters. This being the case, it is easy to see that once the workers realise that anti-waste candidates are capitalist candidates, seeking power for their own ends, and that questions of waste or taxation are purely capitalist questions; they can themselves organise and exercise their voting power purely in working-class interests as opposed to all sections and parties of the capitalist class.

This is the first step towards the emancipation of the working class and the establishment of a system of society where the means of wealth production will be owned in common and democratically controlled by the whole of the people. By educated, conscious and organised action the workers of the world will thus break up the last, most efficient, and brutal form of slavery that has ever flourished, and replace it with a system where production will be arranged according to the needs of all. Where no class will rule because classes will cease to exist, and where the producers of wealth will neither be chattels bought and sold nor the owners of labour-power which they must sell in order to live, but free men and women associating and organising to satisfy their needs with the least possible expenditure of effort, that they may have leisure for the enjoyment of a fuller life.

F. F.

THE "WORLD'S FAIR" OF POLITICS.

It is usual at this time of the year to see displayed on some of the hoardings large posters advertising the "World's Fair." This annual conglomeration of "freaks" and "side-shows" undoubtedly attracts quite a large number of members of the working class, who, anxious to forget for a few moments the wretched conditions of the factory, and also the unhealthy surroundings of their homes, part with a few of their hard-earned coppers to gain admission. Having seen the show, their superficial pleasure is ended; and they return once again to face the real facts of life under capitalism.

These facts are only too apparent to the Socialist, and consequently he becomes more keenly interested in something that happens all the year round; and for the purpose of analogy, we can call it the "World's Fair" of Politics; wherein the average member of the working class can have an endless variety of side-shows to distract his attention from the real cause of his poverty. Every performance is very effectively carried out by a host of "Political Jugglers," Christian "Fortune Tellers," and a troupe of Labour Tamers, who usually perform the celebrated "Red Herring" trick successfully.

After many months the great "Wizard" from Wales has accomplished the "Irish" trick, amidst great applause from the working class—and the "Red" element that we hear so much about are as "Green" as ever.

The Socialist remains cold; such incidents fail to move him from the task he set out to accomplish. That task is to distribute, wherever it is possible, the knowledge of Socialism that he possesses. So long as the workers continue to place political power in the hands of their masters, so long will capitalism remain. Whilst capitalism remains, the capitalists, only a small section of the community, own all the tools and instruments of wealth production, and the working class, which comprise the largest portion in Society, will be forced to sell the only thing that they possess—their labour power—to the capitalist class in order to get food, clothing and shelter.

Whether it be in the form of a "Washington Conflab" or a "League of Take All," as the Socialist points out over and over again, they are no concern of the worker. Whilst capitalism continues the conditions of the working class must tend to grow worse.

Therefore, we urge upon all members of the working class to take advantage of the knowledge distributed by the Socialist Party of Great Britain, become organised into its ranks, and help to bring nearer the day when Socialism will become possible.

A. SPRATT.

JOTTINGS.

It was calculated that Christmas found us with between 6 and 7 millions within the circle of unemployment. Over three million pounds a week are being expended in some form of relief or other.

There appears to be a great diversity of opinion regarding the adequacy of the amount of relief paid. Some believe, and say, the workless are not getting enough. Others believe, and say, they are getting too much. Many people who happen for the time being to be enjoying a comparatively comfortable standard of life, object to the reiteration by the Socialist of the ugly facts of life, saying that, after all, it is only a difference in the point of view.

They mean that if the Socialist would only keep his mouth shut, things would go along much more quietly. The "poor" would be much more content if left alone. But it is not in accord with the principles of a Socialist to go about with his eyes and mouth shut. He is not going to be quiet about anything that affects the existence of the class to which he belongs. The "poor" don't make half the noise they ought to. But it is something more than that, even. The Socialist presents facts, and interprets those facts by the application of a scientific method. When this is done, it is not a question of a point of view at all, but the acceptance of proved testimony. If those facts are of a damaging nature to some people, they will reject them and conveniently adopt a "point of view."

But this so-called point of view itself is determined largely by the economic conditions under which the individual happens to be living. The question of relative security,

for instance. Whilst hunger and poverty of themselves will not make a person into a Socialist, they will yet enable him to distinguish between what might be termed a good time and a rotten one.

Everything is relative—we should go into ecstasies if we were suddenly rewarded with another ten shillings a week, believing we could work wonders with it. And so the Governor of South Australia is resigning his job because he finds his wage of £4,000 a year barely suffices to make ends meet.

o o o

If the assurances of our rulers and their working class supporters had been borne out we should now be living in a land abounding in plenty, and with nothing to mar our happiness. What is the actual state? Does it need describing? Is not every one of us familiar with it—to our sorrow? It is quite true that a great deal of the actual condition is purposely camouflaged so that the intense misery shall not be apparent.

The capitalists are suffering, too, some of them—not physically like we are, but from a shortage of trade. For trade means exploitation, and exploitation means profits.

Singularly enough, the only solution they can offer lies in a steady lowering of the standard of life and the restoration of a competitive selling capacity in the world's markets by a reduction in the price of labour-power.

o o o

One of the results of the capitalists' way of running the world is seen in the present plight of Brazil.

Brazil did not, of course, participate actively in the war, but is, nevertheless, as much a sufferer as anyone else. Indeed, this applies to most countries, whether they were belligerents or not. It shows that the capitalist system is interdependent; to be successful all its parts must work smoothly for the capitalist.

If any disturbance arises within the system, whether it be a financial crisis in peace time, or a war on a big scale, its effects are far-reaching.

The workers, being already poor, are the first to suffer: that is, their sufferings are increased—and they don't know why.

Primarily, in a system like the present, profits is the first and last thing that matters. It is the only precept the capitalist is guided by: sacred to him as furnishing the initiative which he is prone to regard as the driving force in a capitalist-ridden world.

Before the war Germany imported large quantities of coffee from Brazil. Brazil sold coffee to Germany, not because the Germans were fond of coffee, but because it was profitable to do so. Now, Germany is buying no coffee, not because she doesn't want it, but because she hasn't the money to pay for it, and leave the Brazilian planters and exporters with a profit. No profit—no coffee. Brazil retains the coffee, and is in consequence impoverished, with very little money wherewith to buy goods from other countries.

Clearly the lesson is shown: Abolish the system of production only for profits, with its basis of slavery and economic distress, and substitute one of production for use with universal security.

o o o

In associating itself with any measure in which the master class is interested, the Labour Party betrays the fact that it considers there are some points regarding the administration of capitalism which are mutually advantageous to workers and capitalists alike. An instance is the support given to the idea of disarmament. The Labour Party considers this to be a question on which organised labour should make itself heard.

According to Mr. J. H. Thomas, at the recent Regional Conference at Derby, the Labour Party would go further than the Washington Conference in the matter of limiting armaments. "When the Labour Party demanded disarmament it meant it to apply on land, and in the air, as well as on sea."

Dear! dear! And who will they "demand" it of? Everybody knows that the capitalists themselves are the people who will determine what methods of force shall or shall not, prevail. If we find them "limiting" themselves in any particular direction, it is not in response to any "demand," it is because it suits them to do so—in this case because they find the process a rather expensive one.

Questions of disarmament are not working class questions. It may be true, as our "leaders" point out, that millions are being spent on improving the fighting machinery, but it concerns us not in the least.

The worker is robbed, once and for all, at the point of production—that is, in the workshop. When he gets his packet at the week-end, he has got all that is coming to him—he has been skinned to the limit. What happens to the wealth he has been robbed of after he has drawn his pay can make not one iota of difference to his position. The main point is—he hasn't got it. Whether his boss buys cigars or battleships with the money, whether he buys a new car for his wife, or a string of pearls for his mistress, it is all the same—to us.

Armaments, wars, unemployment and poverty are only features of capitalism. They should not be isolated, and efforts concentrated on their abolition, because that is impossible while the system lasts.

The Socialist does not pick out one or two disagreeable things which exist, and concentrate all his energies in "demanding" of those who are responsible for their existence that they shall forthwith abolish them, for that would be foolish. While the Labour Party is organising to "demand" changes within the capitalist system, the Socialist Party is organising to overthrow the system. There's the difference.

TOM SALA.

NOW ON SALE.

MANIFESTO

OF

THE SOCIALIST PARTY

OF GREAT BRITAIN.

Sixth Edition—With New Preface.

Explains the Party's position toward
the S.D.P., I.L.P., Fabian Society,
:: Trade Unions, S.L.P., etc. ::

Price Threepence. Post Free, Fourpence

FROM THE

S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C. 1.

A BRIEF EXPOSITION OF THE SOCIALIST THEORY.

VALUE (continued.)

A commodity has two forms—a physical form (coat, basket, spade, and so forth), and a value form (its worth—though not necessarily its price). As we have already seen, it is a useful article and a valuable article. Its valuable property is made evident in exchange relations. Exchange is very complex now (as witness the recent clear understanding of it can be obtained by voluminous literature on currency), but a examining, in the first place, the simplest form of exchange—or value relation, and then progressing through the more complex forms to the modern price form.

The simplest value relation is the relation of one commodity to another one of a different kind. Let us take Marx's illustration. Suppose we assume that

20 yards of linen equals 1 coat;
now let us analyse this simple relation.

The first thing we learn from it (arising out of what we have previously learnt) is that the same amount of energy was used up in producing the 20 yards of linen as was used up in producing the coat. In other words, the same quantity of the same underlying substance is contained in each of these physically different objects. Value is hidden underneath the value relation. In order to elucidate this point it is necessary to forget, for the moment, the quantity side of the matter (20 yards equals 1) and examine the quality side (linen equals coat). It is obvious that "the magnitude of different things can only be compared quantitatively when those magnitudes are expressed in terms of the same unit." The basis of the relation we are examining is the essential equality of the linen and the coat as products of human energy.

In the linen equals coat value relation the two articles take entirely different, in fact opposite, parts. In putting them into such a relation to one another an essential peculiarity becomes clear; and that peculiarity is that only the value of the linen is being stated—and it is being stated under the disguise of the physical form of the coat. The coat is giving a visible form to the invisible value hidden in the linen. The human energy that was used up in the manufacture of the

linen is now represented by the coat itself. The coat as a *coat* is of no interest to us, we are only concerned with it as solid value, the representative of the value contained in the linen.

If the foregoing is clear, then it must be obvious that if we wished to state the value of the coat it would be necessary to reverse the positions of the two articles in the relation, *e.g.*,

1 coat equals 20 yards of linen.

We have already pointed out earlier in our investigation that human energy can only be measured when it is used up—when it is represented by some object that has been produced. In other words, tailoring or weaving cannot be collected in jugs, although the tailor and weaver have given away something the loss of which makes them feel tired, and necessitates the taking in of more replacing material in the form of food. Further, human energy can only be measured relatively—the product of one man's work with the product of another man's work; or the product of the same man's work in different kinds of articles; finally, the proportions of the total energy of society employed in producing different objects. In the example quoted we have the point illustrated—the quantity of human energy employed in the production of linen is compared with that employed in the production of coats. Appearance tends to hide this fact more and more with the growing complexity of exchange.

From the simplest form of value relation it will be seen that in expressing the value of one article in another each takes up opposite positions in the form of expression. The coat, in the expression 20 yards of linen equals 1 coat, occupies the position of equivalent, *i.e.*, the equal to the value of the linen; the linen, on the other hand, occupies the position of relative, *i.e.*, the article whose value is being expressed in its relation to that of the coat. The linen is only *linen* in this example, but the coat is value itself; 20 yards of linen, for instance, is 1 coat's worth of linen in the case in question.

As these two articles take up opposite positions in the above relation, an effect in one direction on one of them affects the other in the opposite direction. If some new method were devised whereby 40 yards of linen could be produced with the same ex-

penditure of energy as it formerly took to produce 20 yards, then the value relation would be (other things remaining the same):

40 yards of linen equals 1 coat,

or 20 yards of linen equals $\frac{1}{2}$ coat.

A fall in the relative value of linen and a rise in the relative value of coats. If, on the other hand, there were a reduction by half in the energy cost of production of coats the relation would be:

20 yards of linen equals 2 coats,

or 10 yards of linen equals 1 coat.

A fall in the relative of coats and a rise in the relative value of linen.

It is apparent, then, that one article cannot occupy both positions in the same value expression; it cannot be at the same time relative and equivalent—i.e., the article whose value is being stated, and also the object in which that value is being stated. In other words, in a particular value expression an article that occupies one side is thereby excluded from occupying the other side. As Marx puts it:—

“The relative form and the equivalent form are two intimately connected, mutually dependent and inseparable elements of the expression of value; but, at the same time, are mutually exclusive, antagonistic extremes—i.e., poles of the same expression.”

By putting the linen and the coat into the above value relation we are, in reality, illustrating the fact that value-making labour is simple abstract labour. Although the linen and the coat are produced by different kinds of work (weaving and tailoring), and perhaps work of different degrees of skill, yet they are, at bottom, the product of just definite quantities of general labour, and hence they can be put into a relation based upon their equality. Weaving, so far as it produces value, is the same as tailoring.

Perhaps an illustration may make this point clearer.

The making of a coat is one particular form in which a tailor uses his energy; the making of a pair of trousers is another and different particular form, yet coat-making and trouser-making are only different forms of the general activity known as tailoring. Similarly, all productive activity, no matter what particular form it may take, is simply different forms under which human energy is used up.

From the above analysis of the simplest form in which the value of a commodity is made evident, it will be seen that value does not originate in the value form (20 yards of

linen equals one coat), but, on the contrary, this form of expression can only exist because commodities contain value—the form arises out of the nature of value. In other words, value does not originate in exchange, as the advocates of capitalism would have us believe, but value must exist before the exchange relation can arise; production precedes exchange; articles must be produced before they can be exchanged. An article exchanges—or is a commodity—because it possesses value; it does not possess value because it exchanges. It is by taking the form of exchange value—entering into a value relation—that the value of a commodity is given an independent and definite form—in our example the form is that of the coat.

As we have already shown, there is no opposition contained in each commodity between use-value and value. This opposition is given an objective or obvious existence when we put two commodities into an exchange relation, one appearing simply as a use-value (the linen) and the other as value itself (the coat). Consequently, the simple form of value—the one we are examining—is that in which this opposition or contrast is clearly demonstrated.

The form of value we have analysed Marx describes as the “elementary or accidental form of value.” It is defined as “accidental” because the position of a commodity on one or the other side of the relation (as relative or equivalent) depends entirely upon accident, whether it is the one whose value is being expressed or the one expressing value.

Throughout all history the articles obtained by the expenditure of human energy have been use-values—i.e., useful articles—but it was only at a definite point in social development that such articles became commodities—i.e., useful articles produced for exchange. That point was the period when the human energy used up in their production expressed as objective qualities of these articles—as their value. Consequently, the simple form of value is also the earliest historical form under which a product of human energy appeared as a commodity. The earliest form of exchange was primitive barter on the boundaries of ancient territories or during the accidental meetings of peoples on the march. We will make a more detailed examination of the historical development of exchange later on.—GILMAC
(To be continued.)

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the **SOCIALIST STANDARD**, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

| | | |
|----------------------------|----|---------|
| Twelve Months, post free.. | .. | 3s. 0d. |
| Six Months, post free .. | .. | 1s. 6d. |

The Socialist Standard,

SATURDAY



JAN. 7, 1922

H. M. HYNDMAN:

The death of Mr. H. M. Hyndman, at a ripe old age, removes a figure of some prominence from the public life of this country.

He was an example of how an individual, without any outstanding abilities, could become noticeable by association with a set of ideas—not his own—that have stirred the modern world.

When the discoveries and ideas of Marx and Engels were first being spread in this country, H. M. Hyndman took up those ideas, and, despite the fact of their unpopularity, became an advocate of them. The fact that he was a rich man added spice to the position he had taken up.

His grasp of the economic teachings of Marx was good and probably one of the most effective displays he gave in this connection was his lecture on "The Final Futility of Final Utility," given before the Economic Circle of the National Liberal Club.

It is interesting to note that the great defenders of Jevon's theory of "Final Utility"—like G. B. Shaw, Professors Foxwell, Wicksteed, Sidney Webb, etc.—though specially invited, failed to attend that lecture to defend their favourite theory. Maybe the reason is not difficult to find.

The other great discoveries of Marx and Engels, particularly their philosophy of

history, he never assimilated, nor even appeared to understand. This lack of understanding led him into various anti-Socialist activities. In opposition to Marx and Engels he held to the Blanquist position that the establishment of Socialism would be brought about by an "intelligent minority" leading the working class to their emancipation.

It easily followed from this that he was ready to indulge in political compromise—to the great confusion of his followers—and carried this to its logical conclusion when, at the outbreak of the Great War, he became a rabid "patriot," although, with curious inconsistency, he declared that the position of the workers would remain the same no matter which side won.

As one of the so-called "well-educated class" who stood for Marxian economics when others claiming to be Socialists, like Webb, Shaw, etc., were opposing those theories, he will be remembered as something of a pioneer of those days. It was inevitable that his misunderstandings of the Marxian philosophy should have resulted in mis-education and mental confusion among the ranks of the advanced sections of the working class with whom he came in contact either by pen or platform. Some would argue that this confusion and misleading did harm to such an extent as to far outweigh the value of his work in other directions. This is probably true, but it does not obscure the fact that he stood for Marxism when it was being reviled in its early days, and he will be remembered much more for the position he then occupied than for the errors and anti-Socialist actions of his later years.

J. F.

£1,000 FUND.

List of contributions to the above fund will appear in the February issue. Owing to matter not having been made up in time, we regret having to omit same from this number.

In the meantime we should like to remind our wealthy subscribers that we do not refuse New Year Gifts, however large they may be.

LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS OF MARX & ENGELS.
Handsome Cabinet Photographs suitable for framing. Price 1/6 the pair. Postage 3d. extra. To be had from S.P.G.B., 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

CAPITALISM IN EAST AFRICA.

Some seven years ago the present scribe ventured, in the shape of an article in these columns (*History in the Making*), certain observations on economic conditions in East Africa. The interest in these conditions recently displayed by the British capitalist press (from the *Observer* to the *Winning Post*) tempts him to amplify these observations and bring them up to date; especially as the Great War and its effects have forced into prominence the increasing importance of the tropical and sub-tropical zones as sources of raw material and markets for the products of European industry.

The popular notion of tropical Africa derived from the mal-education provided for the workers by the masters might be summed up in three words: "swamps, jungles, and deserts"! While these are by no means figments of the imagination, they do not exhaust the picture. There are thousands of square miles of grassy plains supporting thousands of head of cattle and sheep. There are hundreds of thousands of acres of rich arable land already bringing forth to some extent cotton, sisal, flax, maize, coffee and a host of other items of foodstuffs and raw materials. There are mountain ranges, ten thousand feet or more in height, and hundreds of miles in length, covered with valuable timber, and there are immense lakes and rivers capable, when thoroughly harnessed by the aid of modern science, of irrigating the wildernesses and electrifying half the continent. In fact, there need be no wonder as to why the capitalist powers parcelled out Africa amongst them; its economic possibilities are prodigious! The fly in the ointment is the intrinsic character of capitalism as a system.

In the first place, being a system of exploitation, based upon the monopoly by a small class of the means of life, it meets with the resistance of a relatively intractable human element. It is one thing to proclaim political control of an area several times larger than Britain, and lease to individual capitalists and syndicates large tracts thereof, and quite another to get the small native population to work for that class so established. Extremists among the white invaders (drawn from the bankrupt middle-class of Europe) have from time to time suggested the radical expropriation of the

natives from the soil, but when it is remembered that the natives have few wants, that these are easily satisfied by means of a few acres, and that in any case the total population of Kenya Colony, for example, does not amount to three millions, the technical difficulties in the way of this policy are obvious.

To be sure, bows and arrows, spears and swords would be of little avail against rifles and machine-guns, to say nothing of bombs from aeroplanes, but a solution of the labour problem which consisted simply in exterminating the available supply of labour power would hardly advance capitalist production. This lesson has, of course, had to be learnt from practical Imperial experience in more southerly portions of the continent, such as Rhodesia. A policy which has been applied with success in Europe and Asia, with their redundant millions, has had to be modified when dealing with under-populated Africa.

Secondly, the immensity of Africa's resources is matched by the immensity of its problems. Stock and plant diseases require scientific investigation and control; huge distances require corresponding transport facilities and a comprehensive system of education, technical and literary, has to be established before the native tribes can be expected to keep pace with demands of European progress. All this involves an application of social energy and resources on a magnificent scale, for which capitalism, so far, has provided no adequate organisation.

Every form of capitalist enterprise, from that of the small individual concern to that of the State itself, has but one motive, i.e., the acquisition of profit. It shuns outlay which does not yield a rapid return. It has no interest in posterity. The capitalist class is in Africa to scratch the surface, not to dig deeply; it exhausts temporarily rather than develop natural wealth. Its public representatives talk large and ambitiously. They recognise that this is no country for the "small man," though they have not hesitated to lure him here in considerable numbers for the purpose of sucking him dry. (They call this "encouraging population.") But their activities get little further than talk.

The total white population of East Africa (up till recently predominantly bourgeois) would not provide a decent gate at a second-rate football match in England. Many a scarcely-heard-of country market-town

boasts of greater numbers. Yet this brave land does not hesitate to arrogate to itself the title of "community" (the thirty thousand and odd Indians and natives to the tune of two and a half million being, of course, mere outsiders). While never ceasing to regard the Government as the source of all its woes, it everlastingly appeals to this same Government for this, that or the other scheme without which the "country" must go bankrupt. The Government, in turn, pleads lack of funds; is, in fact, itself on the verge of bankruptcy. It is helpless without loans from the seat of Empire, and the Imperial financiers are not philanthropists. They, too, want quick returns.

All this means that the Government must find revenue. Its attempt to do this by means of an income tax produced, of course, the usual excruciating groans from the "community," which promptly went economy mad. The wholesale discharge of white employees by business firms was followed by a ruthless attack on Civil servants' salaries by the elected members of the Legislative Council. These members, most of them large land owners, recently styled themselves the Reform Party, and distinguished themselves by initiating a crusade against the Indian bourgeoisie, who are pressing even more insistently for equal political and legal rights. The pursuits of this latter group are mainly mercantile, though town property is also one of their specialities.

Enormously enriched by the war boom, they in turn have financed an active Radical propaganda, not merely among their own races but also among the natives, proving in this latter respect more astute than their white opponents. These, in turn, are now forced to adopt a most comical defence, i.e., that they (who have only recently reduced native wages by one-third all-round and who, in season and out of season, have publicly abused the native as a loafer, an ingrate and an immoral and bestial ruffian) are, in reality, the protectors of native interests against Asiatic aggression, the preservers of native innocence from Oriental corruption! Before the war this invocation of the native as a political factor in his own land would have appeared ridiculous, but he, too, is changing his outlook.

Although the Government has been inclined to be chary of conscripting labour for the benefit of every Tom, Dick and Harry of the capitalist class, it has not hesitated

to do so for its own needs. It compulsorily recruited the male natives by the thousand for the military labour corps serving in German East Africa (now Tanganyika Territory), and by the thousand these unfortunates died of starvation, disease and overwork. Vague promises of future reward smoothed the process whereby they were torn away from their homes, and, as usual, these promises proved even more fragile than piecrust. On the contrary, the shortage of labour gave the reason and excuse for a systematic attack upon the native position. In the first place the survivors, on their return, found that the system of registration to which they had become accustomed under the military authorities, was being extended permanently to civil life. Every adult male native employee was docketed and numbered, and provided with a certificate bearing his thumb-print and evidence of his economic history. This badge of slavery serves the same purpose as the brands on the bodies of English proletarians in the 16th and 17th Centuries. It is in every respect an excellent instrument of persecution.

The next "reward" for the heroes was an increase in taxation (levied at so much per head and per hut) of about fifty per cent. ! This on the top of a serious famine which quadrupled maize prices! These famines, which occur in cycles of roughly ten years, are due to rain failure, but are enormously and tragically aggravated by the financial pressure upon the population. In order to find the money for the taxes the native husbandmen (used to cultivating according to their needs) sell the surplus, which in good seasons, should be stored against the inevitable bad ones. They thus sell at the *cheapest* time and find it necessary to buy just when grain is *dear*!

This is fairly obviously the road to ruin! Slowly, but surely, the young men drift to the plantations or the tin-shack townships in search of wages and just as surely increasing numbers of their would-be wives seek refuge in the brothels.

The white "settlers" did not take long to seize their opportunity. The same precious Reform Party above mentioned organised a universal wage-cut. The drop in the extravagant prices of their exported produce supplying the scarcely-needed stimulus.

They were encouraged by the introduction

of the much-discussed Labour Ordinance, according to which the native chiefs were converted in practice into labour recruiters primarily for the Government, secondarily for the settlers. And it is curious to note that this measure was introduced by the very man (Colonel Ainsworth, Chief Native Commissioner) who earned the execration of these same settlers by his amendments to the Masters and Servants' Ordinance.

These amendments, based on war experience, were "intended" to protect native employees from excessive exploitation by the provision of adequate housing, feeding, medical attention, etc. Like the early factory acts in Britain, however, these measures of elementary prudence remain a dead letter through lack of the official machinery necessary to give them real effect.

Having shot his bolt, Colonel Ainsworth retired from the scene of action. So often styled a "pro-native," his real attitude may be summed up as follows: Speaking before the Legislative Council on March 12th, 1918, he said: "Whatever our policy . . . there must and can be only one fundamental as regards rule . . . the white man must be paramount—a white minority will, in reality, form the government, and consequently over ninety per cent. of the total population comprising the black races will practically remain without any real voice in their own affairs." E. B.

(To be continued.)

"THE FRENCH REVOLUTION."

The French Revolution has been a favourite topic with historians of all countries, and it has probably called forth more books than any other event in the history of the world. Yet in the whole literature of the subject one can find little that is consistently good; there is a disproportionate amount of chaff. A book that has just come into my hands, "A Brief History of the French Revolution," by F. W. Aveling, is, however, so really bad, that I think it deserves notice, if only to warn those who might, in their hurry, confuse the author with Edward Aveling, and buy it.

In his preface the author states that the book is intended primarily as a school textbook. No doubt it will have success as such, for it is moulded on the true lines of all modern school histories. It is a

string of events, with nothing to connect them, each one seemingly an accident. The true causes of the revolution and its meaning, the knowledge of which might cause pupils to grow interested in a dangerous field of inquiry, are hidden, and instead the reader is offered a few trumpery excuses, which explain nothing and lead nowhere, but which satisfy that craving for sensation which springs from faulty education and the degrading influence of the press. Aveling's causes of the Revolution bear the same relation to the real origin as does the popular idea of profiteering to the profit-making system. They serve only to hide the relevant facts.

Three reasons are given, viz.:

- (1) The vices and extravagances of the kings and their court.
- (2) The writings of the philosophers and literary men, particularly of J. J. Rousseau; and the growth of unbelief in religion.
- (3) Bad government on the part of the rulers of the land: the oppression of the poor by aristocrats: the absence of any political power on the part of the great mass of the people.

No mention is made of its being a Revolution of the bourgeoisie; rather it is made to appear as working class in its objects, and this, although it is now agreed that the French Revolution was the homologue of the English Revolution of 1640-60, 1688, that it was the triumph of the Capitalist class and the final overthrow of feudalism. Such an omission might be excused to a contemporary, but in a modern history it becomes a suppression, and one is compelled to think that the author is deliberately misleading.

The immorality of the Bourbons had as little to do with the French Revolution as did the morality of Charles I. with the English.

And in view of the fact that the poor in France had always been oppressed by the aristocrats and had never had any political power, it is useless to suggest that this oppression and lack of political power alone could have precipitated the Revolution of 1789. Why 1789 rather than 1400?

The prominence of the philosophers and their sceptical teaching themselves require an explanation. Our author does not, or will not, see this, and so it is not given.

Let us see why the revolution came in

the eighteenth rather than in the fifteenth century.

In the first place, it is necessary to remember that this, like all others, was an economic revolution. It arose owing to the necessity to industrialism of the abolition of the remnants of the feudal barriers. It was a revolution of the French bourgeoisie, which was confronted with impotence and ruin unless it could seize political power and enter on the same course of expansion as England and the newly-freed American Republic.

Up to then political power was concentrated in the hands of a bureaucratic despotism. The nobles and clergy retained their social positions, feudal privileges, and rights. This hampered the development of the industrial and trading classes, for which a free working-class, as opposed to feudal serfs, and a free circulation of commodities were essential. The *Gabelle*, a government monopoly of the sale of salt, and the *Banvin*, or the right enjoyed by the lord of the manor to sell his own wine in the parish, to the exclusion of any other, are but two examples of the many feudal privileges which stood in the way of free development of commerce and industry.

Again, taxation was high, and owing to the exemption from it enjoyed by the nobles and clerics, its burden fell on the propertied commercial class. In the army aristocrats held the chief posts, so that the ambitions of bourgeois officers were checked. This explains the willingness of the lower officers to usurp authority and lead their troops against the dominant class.

It was the growth of the bourgeoisie in France, with its accompanying necessity for a new philosophy and set of ideals, which gave rise to the liberal spirit noticeable earlier in the century. In particular, intercourse with other countries and with England, from which the newly invented machinery was beginning to be imported, fostered this spirit, of which the writings of Montesquieu, Voltaire, and Rousseau are but the expression. To place too great an importance in the effects of their books is dangerous, especially as only about 4 per cent. of the population could read.

They were the philosophers of the rising capitalists, and it was among the members of this class in the main that they found readers and popularity.

To say, as the author does, that they spread democratic ideas among the masses,

is to show a complete ignorance of their works.

Rousseau looked longingly to the Roman State and a return to nature. Montesquieu and Voltaire aimed merely at adopting the English constitutional system. Buckle, in his "Civilisation in England," lays great stress on this, and Gustave le Bon, a middle-class author, writes: "Although the philosophers, who have been supposed the inspirers of the French Revolution, did attack certain privileges and abuses, we must not for that reason regard them as partisans of popular government" ("Psychology of Revolution").

When Louis XVI., owing to the financial difficulties of the government, was forced to summon the States General, the time for the seizure of political power by the revolutionary bourgeoisie had arrived.

To obtain control of the Tiers Etat, they, with their cry of "Free the land!" obtained the support of the peasants, but "they were as undemocratic at bottom as men well could be; their feeling for the masses was nothing but a mixture of scorn and fear; the perfect type of the bourgeois of '89 combined hatred of the nobles with distrust of the mob" ("French Revolution," Louis Madelin).

Thanks to the support of the lesser clergy, who suffered from the tyranny of the great prelates, they obtained control in the National Assembly, and at once proceeded to destroy all that remained of feudalism. In a short time seigniorial rights were abolished, serfs were freed, and later the Church lands were confiscated.

Meanwhile, in the towns unemployment, consequent on machine production superseding hand labour in many trades, together with lack of bread, occasioned by bad harvests, destruction of the crops by agents of the bourgeoisie, and the speculations of the grain merchants, who were holding back supplies, caused the workers to support the rising class. This provided them with a force which at need they could bring out to overcome the Royalists.

The weakness of Louis and the need to crush the nobility and clergy completely, rendered the introduction of a constitutional monarchy impossible, although certain sections favoured it. And so Louis was executed and a Republic proclaimed.

The rising of the Revolution from the National Assembly to the Directory, which

paved the way for Napoleon to consolidate the gains of the triumphant class, is a history of struggles between sections of the bourgeoisie, and of their efforts to drive back the workers into subjection after they had served the needs of their masters.

Even the Terror is a period of bourgeois domination.

But our author would not stain the honour of the master class, our present rulers, so he reviles the workers for the executions. And this in spite of the fact that "out of 2,750 victims of Robespierre only 650 belonged to the upper or middle classes. The tumbrils that wended their way daily to the Place de la Revolution and afterwards to the Faubourg St. Antoine were largely filled with working-men" ("French Revolution," Belfort Bax).

Robespierre himself was merely a tool, although perhaps an unconscious tool, of the bourgeoisie; he served them by destroying the more liberal-minded Herbertists, and was destroyed himself when his task was accomplished.

But although it was not, and could not be, a working-class revolution, study of the French Revolution is of value to the proletariat for two reasons. Firstly, it demonstrates the truth of the Materialist Conception of History.

Society rests on an economic basis and it is only by examination of this foundation that one can understand the nature and development of the institutions, ideas, and cultural activities of the classes of which the particular society is composed, and explain outstanding historical and political movements and events.

Secondly, it shows the futility of working-class action without class-consciousness.

The workers allowed themselves to be stirred up to do the behests of a higher class, they fought their battles for them, and then, when they had done all that was wanted of them, they were forced into a new and worse servitude. They were surrounded and disarmed on their return from the army. Their organisations were broken up by "Jeunesse Dorée" (the White Guards of the period) armed with weighted canes!

And attempts of the workers to achieve their emancipation will always end in failure until they, by study, learn their position in society as slaves of the propertied

class, and then, acting as a class, gain control of political power and the force it commands.

W. J. R.

A CHRISTMAS CAROL.

Once again we have been treated to the customary sentimental piffle in the press regarding what is known as the festive season. The *Daily News* has made for us the round of the pulpits, so that our hearts may be made strong and our spirits raised to face the coming year. But, alas! there is always a fly in the ointment; and though the *D.N.* has done its best it could not avoid mentioning unemployment. But stoutly ignoring the other 364 days, it gleefully informs us that "for the first time there was no need for anyone to be hungry on Christmas Day." If we ask, Is there any need for anyone to be hungry on, say, the 2nd of April, we shall be told we are extremists and disturbers of the social peace!

Nevertheless, we do ask it; and since the *D.N.* will not answer us we will address our query to you. When you drew your savings from the slate club on Christmas Eve, did you bother to think that you have no guarantee that you will not be hungry on the 2nd of April? For our part, we should think that the hard-earned turkey on Christmas Day and no other day would be one of the most cogent reasons for discontent. We do not insist that life is most happily spent in eating turkey and Christmas pudding each day of the year, but with no desire to hurt the feelings and heartfulness (poet's license, and be careful of the "H," Mr. Printer) of the *D.N.*, we cannot see that there is any cause for congratulation in the fact that everybody had one meal for keeps in 1921. Mind you, we are not making too scathing a criticism, we are resolutely dismissing from our memory the poor wretch we met this morning who had subsisted on Christmas Day on little more than a crust of bread. We will not let creep into our minds the image of the thousands whom we know have not the wherewithal to eat nor to sleep at Christmas time, nor, indeed, at any other time.

If, however, we must justify our existence by acting the "skeleton at the feast," we will respectfully inform the *D.N.* that not only is their statement a lie, but that it is an insult. And that, we think, all things considered, is just about as politely as we dare put it.

S.

FOSTER PARENTS.

It is interesting to note how at this time of the year the Press weep tears of tenderness over the starving bodies of the workers who have been cast down to such depths of misery by the workings of the capitalist system; the hypocrisy of the writers is only emphasised by the humility with which the doles of food and clothing are received by the victims of capitalism. Under the heading of "Adopting a Family: a Useful Birmingham Scheme," the *Birmingham Mail* (20-11-'21) quotes the *Daily Post*: "The suggestion that individuals should 'adopt' necessitous families has elicited a promising response and a considerable extension of the movement appears likely."

Apparently, the master class are somewhat alarmed at the widespread effects of the industrial crisis and the possibility of disturbances if no attempt is made to alleviate the distress other than by the Government unemployment pay, or the Guardians' dole; hence the special efforts and the appeals to Christmas sentiment to gain support for the various schemes of adoption, Christmas dinners, etc., in order to counteract any attempt by the unemployed to parade their miseries before the very doors of their masters.

It is probable also that there is a fear that the efficiency of the working class will be seriously deteriorated, and therefore the necessity arises for them to be kept in such physical health as will ensure wage slaves capable of standing the strain of the next period of booming trade.

The *Post* admits the "State benefit is barely sufficient to pay the rent; the Guardians," we are told, "are willing to adopt a scale of relief which ensures the recipient from starvation."

May I suggest that there are three grades of starvation: firstly, nothing at all to eat unless one takes on the rôle of a Nebuchadnezzar, or the advice of Foulon, "Let them eat grass." Secondly, the Guardians' scale—just sufficient to keep a flicker of life in the badly-clothed cold-racked bodies of the unemployed. Thirdly, the miserable wage (a much desired attainment) of the employed, which will buy a few more ounces of marge and a few more pounds of bacon and cheese than fall to the lot of the unemployed; in short, the necessary fuel to generate the energy to set in motion the human machine

for its purpose under capitalism—the production of surplus value. "Truth will out" is an old saying, and its aptness is clear in the following:—"The present trade depression is unparalleled in extent, and has engulfed hundreds, if not thousands, of families who have never before been unable to provide for themselves. This is their first acquaintance with poverty and adversity, and many of them will suffer untold misery rather than appeal to the poor law."

To the worker who gives any thought to his position the true interpretation of that statement goes far beyond the desire of the composer; these thousands of families were previously in the third stage, before mentioned, of starvation, as the fact that they are now in the first stage proves, for they were not able whilst at work to provide for the rainy day which capitalist mentors are always so keen on exhorting them to prepare for. The drizzle is always with the working class, excepting when, as now, it rains with a vengeance.

The article informs us that families are recommended by a body called the "Citizen Society," with which enquirers are put in touch. And then follows an instance how the scheme works.

An inquirer desired to be put into communication with some suitable family; he was supplied with the particulars of two (suitable, of course), and the inquirer wrote the *Post* as follows: "I visited the two families whose names you gave me, and both seem such genuine ones that I have decided to adopt the two."

What sublime feelings of humanity came over the visitor whilst inspecting these cases that "seem" to be so suitable, so genuine! One can almost imagine them to be cases of whiskey, with appropriate labels of "Genuine Scotch," about which the inquisitor appears a little doubtful, and prefers caution until actual experience with the liquor enables him to give a more pronounced opinion.

At this rate of adoption there will not be a single starving family in Birmingham; perhaps not in the whole country—until next summer. Further, there can be no doubt a desperate struggle will take place between individual capitalists for the genuine best brands to be plucked from the hell of starvation; in my mind's-eye I can see a smug, philanthropic, hygienic Lord of Ballyville Paradise having it on with the Screwjah

of Brum. as to which shall have the honour of relieving some necessitous family. Life will be one long holiday for the unemployed, with cakes and pictures thrown in, if this idea spreads. But stay, who is going to decide the scale (useful term) of food for the adopted family; what will be the menu? Will it assume the proportions of a ration just sufficient to keep alive the victims of capitalism, or will it be on the same scale as the patron's family?

We get a little enlightenment on this point when we read in relation to the adopted family of the staff of the *Post*: "it is hoped to keep the family in a state of efficiency until they are again able to provide for themselves."

So it is evident the adopted are to have just enough for the purpose of keeping them in such condition as when the depression is over they will be capable of producing once again a maximum of surplus value for their masters, and thus the true reason for the scheme leaks out. But the generosity embodied in it is of so far-reaching a character that it is necessary for others to share in it, and so the co-operation of individuals, of church, of shop, and office staffs is called for, in order "to see some deserving case through the trials of winter."

Those in work are reminded they can adopt a family or families "according to the means at their disposal." This implies that the rich are so desirous of helping the starving unemployed that they ask the starving employed to help with contributions from wages which have been bumping down during the last year.

"Personal adoption has great potentialities for good," we are told. "It introduces the personal touch which is so valuable to both parties to the transaction, and creates an atmosphere of friendliness and sympathy which is lacking in the most carefully conceived forms of public charity."

Such schemes can only be valuable to one party, and that party is the ruling class, for the notion is kept alive that humanity is all that is required to regulate the affairs and alleviate the troubles of the present; they are built up on the assumption that there must always be poverty, and the idea is general amongst the workers that it is the duty of the rich to alleviate the miseries of the poor with gifts of clothing, food and money. It is not the duty of the rich, neither is it the duty of groups of workers

such as office and works staffs to take part in such temporary expedients. The former will pretend there is such a thing as duty in this connection, and preach that duty to others through their mouthpieces in the Press and pulpit, in order to lighten the burden for themselves. But when the working class, unemployed or employed, delve down to the root reason for their misery and poverty, they will then see that trade depressions with their effects, and trade booms with their overwork, inevitably accompany a system of world-wide commodity production.

The abolition of poverty can only be within measure of realisation when the workers understand that the material conditions for producing wealth as water flows from a tap are here; they will then march on direct to the goal, the possession of the political machine, and in the name of society convert the land, factories and tools from private into common property.

The basis of society having then undergone the revolutionary change, that freedom which poets sing of will be possible; no man, woman or child will be patronised, for each man and woman capable of work will take his or her part in the social labours required by society's needs, and the fruits of those labours being owned by the whole of society must needs be distributed in conformity with that basis. When the working class understand the principles of Socialism they will take the necessary action to abolish capitalism with its attendant evils of poverty and canting humbug, removing once and for all the obstacle which stands in the way of equality, liberty and fraternity.

E. J.

Will those interested

in the formation of a branch of the Party in Peckham, Camberwell and district,

Please communicate with:—

J. VEASEY,

c/o The Socialist Party of Great Britain,
17, MOUNT PLEASANT, W.C.1.

SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain**BRANCH DIRECTORY.**

BATTERSEA.—Communications to A. Jones, 8 Matthew-st., Letchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets Mondays, 8.30, at 16 Creek-st., York-rd.

BIRMINGHAM.—Communications to L. Vinetsky, 11 Upper Dean-st., Birmingham. Branch meets A.E.U. Institute, Spiceal-st., every Saturday.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.

EAST LONDON.—Communications to A. Jacobs, Sec., 78 Eric-st., Mile-end, E.8. Branch meets first and third Mondays in month at 141 Bow-rd.

EDMONTON.—Communications to the Sec., 142 Bulwer-rd., Edmonton, N.18.

HACKNEY.—Communications to the Sec., 78 Greenwood-rd., E.8. Branch meets Fridays, 7.30, at the Sigdon-rd. Schools, opposite Hackney Downs Stn.

HANLEY.—Branch meets Mondays, Working Men's Club, Glass-st. Communications to Sec., T. Travis, 27, Arthur Street, Cobridge, Staffs.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144 Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Communications to W. Baker, 85 Alma-st., Kentish Town, N.W.

MANCHESTER.—Communications to Sec., J. Lloyd 2 Chapel-st., Chester-rd., Hulme, Manchester.

N.W. LONDON.—Branch meets Monday at 7, at 107, Charlotte Street, W.1. Communications to Sec., 17, Mount Pleasant, W.C.1. Discussion after branch business.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Communications to Sec., J. Bird, 5 Wellington-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.

TOOTING.—Communications to Sec., 24 Worslade-rd., Tooting, S.W.17. Branch meets Fridays at Parochial Hall, Church-lane, Tooting, at 8 p.m.

TOTTENHAM.—Sec., C. Stowe, 15 Culvert-rd., S. Tottenham, N.15. Branch meets Saturdays 7.30 at Earlsmead Schools, Broad-lane, Tottenham. Discussion after branch business. Public invited.

WALTHAMSTOW.—Communications to Sec., 11 Carlton-rd., Walthamstow, E.17. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.

WATFORD.—A. Lawson, Sec., 107 Kensington-avenue, Watford.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167 Romford rd., Stratford. Communications to P. Hallard, 22 Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN.—Branch meets Fridays at 8.30 at Brook Hall, Brook-rd., Mayes-rd., N.22.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS**LONDON DISTRICT.****Sundays:**

Clapham Common, 3 p.m.
Edmonton, Silver Street, 11.30 a.m.
Finsbury Park, 3 p.m.
Stratford, Vicarage-lane, 7.30 p.m.
Tooting Broadway, Garrett-lane, 11.30 a.m.
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 7.30 p.m.
Victoria Park, 3.30 p.m.
Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's-hill, 7.30 p.m.

Mondays:

Highbury Corner, 8 p.m.

Tuesdays:

Tooting, Church-lane, 8 p.m.

Thursdays:

Dalston, Queen's-road, 8.30 p.m.
Wimbledon Broadway, 8 p.m.

Fridays:

Tottenham, Junction Clyde-road and Phillip-lane, 8 p.m.

Saturdays:

Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's-hill, 8 p.m.
Tooting, Undine-street, 8 p.m.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.**OBJECT.**

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles.**THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain****HOLDS—**

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.